

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Group Art Unit 2622, Expedited Procedure

03630.000227.

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 22 2005

In re Application of:

NEIL Y. IWAMOTO, ET AL.

Application No.: 09/357,593

Filed: July 20, 1999

For: SECURE PRINTING OVER
CABLE NETWORK TO HOME
PRINTER

Examiner: I. Rahimi

Group Art Unit: 2622

February 22, 2005

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION
AND
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Sir:

This is a response to the Office Action dated October 21, 2004, the period for response to which having been extended to Tuesday, February 22, 2005, the first regular day of business following the President's Day holiday. The October 21 Office Action entered a final rejection of all claims over U.S. Patent 6,543,052 (Ogasawara) in

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on:

February 22, 2005
(Date of Deposit)Michael K. O'Neill, Reg. No. 32,622
(Name of Attorney for Applicant)

Signature

February 22, 2005
Date of Signature

view of U.S. Patent 5,878,141 (Daly), or over Ogasawara and Daly and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,385,655 (Smith). Claims 1 to 21 are in the application. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The undersigned thanks the Examiner and Supervisor Coles for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment afforded during a personal interview conducted on February 16, 2005. During the interview, it was agreed that the Office would withdraw finality of the rejection and conduct an updated search. A statement of the substance of the interview follows herewith.

The invention concerns "push" printing over the internet from a client (such as a web merchant) to a printer connected through an interface device (such as a set-top-box ("STB")) to a cable network. A determination is made as to whether first and second secure communication paths are established, and in response to the determination, print data is transmitted from the client to the interface and thereafter from the interface to the printer.

In entering the rejection over Daly, the Office Action took the position that Daly's column 14 showed a determination of whether first and second communication paths have been established. It was agreed at the interview, however, that column 14 discloses only a single path (that is, a single path from the cable head end to the set top box, and not first and second paths). Indeed, nothing in Daly shows first and second communication paths, and on this basis it was agreed to withdraw finality of the rejection. Moreover, the rejection relies on Ogasawara's column 3 as allegedly showing the transmission of print data in response to a determination that first and second secure paths

have been established. As explained at the interview, however, this rejection is inconsistent with the Office Action's concession that Ogasawara does not show any such determination; and as a consequence, Ogasawara could not possibly disclose that any actions (much less transmission of print data) could possibly be conditioned on these determinations.

For these reasons, the Examiner and Mr. Coles agreed that the Office would withdraw finality of the rejection and conduct an updated search. These actions are requested.

Claim 12 was not discussed at the interview. Claim 12 is a method for the secure printing of print data from a client application residing on a data network to an interface device which has a printer, the interface device residing on a digital cable network which has a cable head end for interfacing the digital cable network to the data network. According to the method of Claim 12, print data is generated in the client application which also transforms the print data from a device-independent format to a rasterized format in accordance with a printer driver corresponding to the printer attached to the interface device. The client application encrypts print data in the rasterized format and sends the encrypted print data in the rasterized format from the client application to the cable head end. The encrypted print data is sent in the rasterized format from the cable head end to the interface device which decrypts the print data in the rasterized format for printing by the printer.

The art applied against Claim 12, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the above features of independent Claim 12. Page 6 of

the Office Action, in the context of dependent Claim 4, apparently relies on the Smith patent for many of these features, but Smith is seen to be deficient in that it discusses nothing concerning transformation of print data from a device-independent format to a rasterized format in accordance with a printer driver, encrypting the print data, sending the encrypted print data (still in a rasterized format) to a cable head end, sending the encrypted print data (still in a rasterized format) from the cable head end to an interface device, and decrypting the print data in the interface device to a plain-text rasterized format for printing by a printer. Allowance of Claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Turning to a formal matter involving the Information Disclosure Statement dated March 22, 2004, it is respectfully requested for the Examiner to consider the art cited therein and to make this art formally of record. This is a third request.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 82364v1